



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,894	07/03/2001	Steven S. Watanabe	112056-0003	7035

24267 7590 04/03/2006
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/898,894	Applicant(s) WATANABE ET AL.	
	Examiner Etienne P LeRoux	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claims Status

Claims 1-46 are pending. Claims 1-46 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 46 recites “performing a parallel retrieval process for a plurality of messages in the swarm of messages by processing the messages in a somewhat arbitrary order.” The specification does not include a clear and concise description of the manner and process of “processing the messages in a somewhat arbitrary order” such that a skilled artisan would be convinced that at the time the filing, that applicant had possession of the invention.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 46 recites “performing a parallel retrieval process for a plurality of messages in the swarm of messages by processing the messages in a somewhat arbitrary order.” The scope of the invention cannot be determined because it is unclear what comprises a somewhat arbitrary order.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 8-24 and 26-40 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,440,726 issued to Fuchs et al (hereafter Fuchs) in view of US Pat No 5,588,117 issued to Karp et al (hereafter Karp) and further in view of US Pat No 6,128,762 issued to Jadav et al (hereafter Jadav).

Claims 1, 10, 15, 20, 26, 31, 36, 37 and 46:

Art Unit: 2161

Fuchs discloses:

a log in the backup memory containing storage system transaction entries accumulated after a consistency point at which time results of the transaction entries are committed to the disk array [Fuchs, col 3, lines 28-33]

Fuchs discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose an initiator process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the transaction request entries and delivers the swarm to the file system. Karp discloses an initiator process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the transaction request entries and delivers the swarm to the file system [Fig 2, col 3, lines 25-45].¹ It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fuchs to include an initiator process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the transaction request entries and delivers the swarm to the file system as taught by Karp for the purpose of establishing a communications protocol using group ordered message processing [Karp, abstract].

The combination of Fuchs and Karp discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but is silent regarding a parallel disk-information retrieval process in the file system that is carried out on the swarm of messages in parallel. Jadav discloses a disk-information retrieval process in the file system that is carried out on the swarm of messages [Fig 1, col 3, line 49 through col 4, line 2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include a parallel disk-information retrieval process in the file system that is carried out on the swarm of

¹ swarm of messages is interpreted as group of messages per Applicant's direction in Amendment of February 27, 2006.

Art Unit: 2161

messages as taught by Jadav for the purpose of providing a RAID system which includes parallel computing architecture [Jadav, col 2, lines 4-10].

Claim 2:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein each of the messages of the swarm is identified by a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries in the log, respectively, and a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of (a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claims 3, 23, 29 and 34:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 1 and 2 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

Claims 4, 24, 30 and 35:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 1-3 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 8:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the backup memory comprises a non-volatile random access memory (NVRAM) [col 3, line 5].

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 9:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the storage system comprises a network storage appliance [title]

Claim 11:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein each of the messages of the swarm is identified by a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries in the log, respectively, and a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of (a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 12:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 10 and 11 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

Claim 13:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav of claims 10-12 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 14:

Art Unit: 2161

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the storage system comprises a network storage appliance [Fig 1, item 12 and col 5, lines 57-65]

Claim 16:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 15 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses establishing for each of the messages of the swarm, a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries in the log, respectively, in the log and a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of :

(a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26],

Claim 17:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 15 and 16 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

Claim 18:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 15-17 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 19:

Art Unit: 2161

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 15 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the storage system comprises a network storage appliance [Fig 1, item 12 and col 5, lines 57-65].

Claims 21, 27 and 32:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 20 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses each of the messages of the swarm is identified by a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claims 22, 28 and 33:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 20 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of (a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 23:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 20 and 22 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32].

Claim 24:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 20-23 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 27:

Art Unit: 2161

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 26 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses each of the messages of the swarm is identified by a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 28:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 20 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of (a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 29:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 20 and 28 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

Claim 30:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 20, 28 and 29 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 32:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 31 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses each of the messages of the swarm is identified by a transaction block including a pointer to one of the transaction request entries [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 33:

Art Unit: 2161

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 31 and 32 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a state that indicates whether each of the messages is one of (a) newly transferred to the file system [col 3, lines 17-26].

Claim 34:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 31 and 32 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the prerequisite event is completion of the load phase and a modify phase with respect to another of the messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

Claim 35:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claims 31-34 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses wherein the initiator process is adapted to retransfer each of the messages incapable of being subject to a load phase until the prerequisite event occurs to the file system for completion of the load phase after the prerequisite event occurs respectively [col 16, lines 39-53]

Claim 38:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a third process that modifies at least some messages in the swarm of messages based on the order in which storage system transactions entries were stored in the log [col 11, lines 3-19].

Claim 39:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 10 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a third process that modifies at least some messages in

Art Unit: 2161

the swarm of messages based on the order in which storage system transactions entries were accumulated in the log [col 11, lines 3-19].

Claim 40:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 26 as noted above and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a third process that modifies at least some messages in the swarm of messages based on the order in which storage system transactions entries were accumulated in the log [col 11, lines 3-19].

1. Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav and further in view of Pub No 2003/0131190 issued to Park et al (hereafter Park).

Claim 5:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav Fuchs discloses the elements of claims 1- 4 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm. Park discloses wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm [paragraph 9]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is

Art Unit: 2161

unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm as taught by Park. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the above combination of references per the above for the purpose of purpose of skipping defective sectors [paragraph 9].

Claim 25.

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 20 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm. Park discloses wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm [paragraph 9]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include wherein the initiator is adapted to establish a skip state with respect to a skipped messages for which a portion of the disk array associated therewith is unavailable, the skip state thereby omitting the skipped messages from the swarm as taught by Park. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the above combination of references per the above for the purpose of purpose of skipping defective sectors [paragraph 9].

2. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav and further in view of US Pat No 6,330,570 issued to Crighton (hereafter Crighton).

Art Unit: 2161

Claim 6:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 4 as noted above but fails to disclose wherein the file system includes a panic state adapted to alert an operator if a message received from the initiator in the swarm is a message incapable of being subject to a load phase until a prerequisite event occurs. Crighton discloses a failure in reading a file or writing the file to the backup apparatus triggers a warning message [col 2, lines 34-36]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to obtain wherein the file system includes a panic state adapted to alert an operator if a message received from the initiator in the swarm is a message incapable of being subject to a load phase until a prerequisite event occurs. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the above combination of references per the above for the purpose of alerting an operator if a backup has not been successfully completed [col 2, lines 26-30].

Claim 7:

The combination of Fuchs, Karp and Jadav discloses the elements of claim 4 as noted above but fails to disclose wherein the file system includes a panic state adapted to alert an operator if a message is retransferred by the initiator process is a message incapable of being subject to a load phase until a prerequisite event occurs. Crighton discloses a failure in reading a file or writing the file to the backup apparatus triggers a warning message [col 2, lines 34-36]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Fuchs '726 and Crighton '726 to include wherein the file system includes a panic state adapted to alert an operator if a message is retransferred by the initiator

Art Unit: 2161

process is a message incapable of being subject to a load phase until a prerequisite event occurs.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Fuchs and Crighton as per the above for the purpose of alerting an operator if a backup has not been successfully completed [col 2, lines 26-30].

3. Claims 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,440,726 issued to Fuchs et al (hereafter Fuchs).

Claims 41, 44 and 45:

Fuchs discloses:

a backup memory storing a plurality of file system transaction entries [Fig 1, 82]

a second process that performs a load phase in a concurrent manner for a plurality of messages in the swarm of messages [col 14, lines 11-32]

a third process that performs a modify phase for at least some messages in the swarm of messages, the modify phase operating on messages based on the order in which file system transaction entries were stored in the backup memory [col 11, lines 3-19]

Fuchs discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose a first process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the file system.

Karp discloses but does not disclose a first process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the file system [Fig 2, col 3, lines 25-45]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fuchs to include but does not disclose a first process that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the file system as

taught by Karp for the purpose of establishing a communications protocol using group ordered message processing [Karp, abstract].

Claim 42:

The combination of Fuchs and Karp discloses the elements of claim 41 as noted above, and furthermore, Fuchs discloses a fourth process that determines whether a file system transaction entry corresponds to a file system transaction that can be performed right away [col 10, lines 15-40]

Claim 43:

The combination of Fuchs and Karp discloses the elements of claims 41 and 42 as noted above and furthermore Fuchs discloses wherein the fourth process, in response to determining that the file system transaction cannot be performed right away, associates the file system transaction entry with a load retry state until a prior prerequisite transaction is performed [col 10, lines 15-40]

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 27, 2006 have been fully considered but are not persuasive for the reasons given below.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the first paragraph of page 19:
Applicant respectfully urges that cited patents, Fuchs, Karp and Jadav, are completely silent concerning applicant's claimed novel "an initiator that establishes a swarm of messages with respect to the storage system transaction entries."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the claims are interpreted in light of the specification without reading limitations from the specification into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The claim language "swarm of messages" when interpreted according to the specification is simply a group of messages. Support for this conclusion is provided by applicant in Amendment of February 27, 2006, paragraph 3 which states:

Applicant uses the standard definition for 'swarm of messages' which is a 'group of messages' as shown in the specification page 5, lines 7-8, which states 'a technique for transferring a group of cline transaction request entries the file system as a swarm of messages.

A common dictionary² definition for "group" the following is obtained:
basic general word expressing the simple of idea of an assembly of persons animals or things without further connotation. Examiner concludes that "swarm of messages" can be interpreted as a group of messages, i.e., an assembly of messages without further connotation. Considering above definition of "swarm of messages" the following disclosure by Karp is pertinent:

Karp discloses the following in column 2, lines 27-33:

The sending portion includes a control unit for segmenting the messages to be sent into groups, assigning a required number of messages value to each of the groups, and sending the messages together with the required number of messages value associated therewith to the another of the processing nodes.

² Webster's New World Dictionary, Fourth Edition.

Art Unit: 2161

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the first paragraph of page 19:

Applicant respectfully urges that cited patents, Fuchs, Karp and Jadav are completely silent concerning applicant's claimed novel a disk information-retrieval process in the file system that is carried out on the swarm of messages in parallel.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Claim 1 has most recently been amended and above claim language does not reflect the most recent claim amendment. Furthermore, applicant is referred to above Office Action where the correct claim limitation is mapped to the cited prior art.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the second paragraph of page 19:

Accordingly, applicant respectfully urges that Fuchs, Karp, and Jadav, taken either singly or in combination are legally precluded from rendering Applicant's claimed novel invention unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) because of the absence from the cited prior art of applicant's claimed novel "a parallel disk information-retrieval process in the file system that is carried out on the swarm of messages."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Jadav discloses the following in column 3, line 49 through column 4, line 2:

In preferred embodiments, the computers 6a, b, c run parallel processing software, such as the ORACLE PARALLEL SERVER.TM., the MICROSOFT.RTM. Wolfpack Clustering System or any other clustering software. ORACLE PARALLEL SERVER is a trademark of Oracle Corporation; MICROSOFT is a registered trademark of Microsoft Corporation. This parallel processing software allows the computers 6a, b, c to share storage devices 10a, b, c such that any node 4a, b, c may access any block in any of the storage devices 10a, b, c. This parallel

Art Unit: 2161

architecture allows data to be distributed across different storage devices 10a, b, c throughout the shared device system 2. The parallel processing software, implemented in the computers 6a, b, c, may perform logical locking to insure that only one write request is made to a block in any of the storage devices 10a, b, c, at any given time and to insure that an application does not attempt to read a block being modified by another application. To perform logical locking under control of the parallel processing software, the computers 6a, b, c would exchange messages, data, and information via the additional network 13. The adaptors 8a, b, c perform physical locking.

Jadav discloses parallel processing as noted above.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the first paragraph of page 21 the following regarding claim 41:

Applicant respectfully urges that both cited patents, Fuchs and Karp are completely silent concerning Applicant's claimed novel "and delivers the swarm of messages to the file system, a second process that performs a parallel load phase for a plurality of messages in the swarm of messages."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner maintains above comment by applicant is fully covered by above responses by examiner.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

March 30, 2006

